druile

Approved For Release 2004/11/03 : CIA-RDP89B00552R000100110034-0

1 9 AUG 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Review Staff

SUBJECT

Discussion with HSC Representatives Charles Mattox and Sandra Zeune Re

Proprietaries (10:15 Monday 18 August 1975)

1. The HSC representatives initially asked for a background briefing on the Audit Staff. I discussed the initial effort within the Office of Security in the late 40's and the expanded effort in the 50's due to the increase in proprietary activity and the lack of auditors trained in commercial auditing. I mentioned that nine members of the Audit Staff had been recruited from GAO to fill this experience gap. I indicated that proprietaries have been controlled very tightly over the years through the regulatory process. In addition they have been audited almost entirely on an annual basis. These audits determined compliance with administrative plans and project approvals and emphasized, among other things, maintaining a maximum of three months working capital on hand at any time.

2. At this point Mr. Mattox asked a number of questions the first of which was in regard to our relationship with the Internal Revenue Service. He was told that we filed all the appropriate federal and state returns required and that to the best of our knowledge there had never been any real problem resulting from returns being reviewed by the Internal Revenue Service. However, we indicated that there was a point of contact between OGC and the Internal Revenue Service in order to stop any investigation that might have involved surfacing any intelligence sources and methods. We were not aware of any specific case in which this contact had been used. The investigators were advised that an attempt was made to have each proprietary show a minimum profit in order that they would not attract undue attention.

25X1

SEGRET

Approved For Release 2004/11/03: CIA-RDP89B00552R000100110034-0

- 2 -

3. It was stressed that the major purpose of proprietaries was to perform a necessary Agency operation and not to compete in the commercial market. In response to a query regarding the number of proprietaries it was indicated that the greatest number of proprietaries was in the mid 60's and that after a formal committee study and report at about that time the number has been rapidly declining. We also stressed that there are strict rules regarding the operation of a proprietary and that these rules are contained in and elaborated upon in	25X1
4. Mr. Mattox then indicated that they would probably want a list of all active proprietaries in 1970 with the additions and deletions from that date to the present. He then asked how many proprietaries there are currently and I indicated that there	
	25X1
the mistaken notion that we had a warehouse full of excess proprietary property We quickly corrected this erroneous assumption and indicated that except in the cases with which he was already familiar any assets remaining in dissolution	
would have been of very minimal value and would of necessity have been disposed of in a normal commercial manner in order to prevent showing that the corporation was Government connected.	
5. We then discussed the fact that we had over the years	
called on several of the "big 8" public accounting firms to do	
audits for us. Mr. Mattox wanted to know if this meant that	•
we could currently call any one of the big eight and ask them to conduct an audit for us. I indicated that except for a recent	-
use of it has been a number of years since we	
had occasion to make any use of these big public accounting firms. Miss Zeune at that point inquired as to whether we had a CPA	
firm of our own. I indicated that we did and it had responsibility for doing any commercial audits which we needed. Miss	
Zeune asked who audited the CPA firm and I indicated that this	
is done by the Audit Staff. Mr. Mattox then inquired as to	
whether companies had ever used their audited balance sheet as	
a basis for obtaining a bank loan. To the best of our knowledge	

25X1

case.

25X1

25X1

25X1

and he was thoroughly familiar with that

the only occasion in which this happened was in the case of

SEGHET

Approved For Release 2004/11/03 : CIA-RDP89B00552R000100110034-0

- 3 -

- 6. Miss Zeune then asked whether the corporations invested in stocks and bonds and I told her that the only significant investment of this type was in one proprietary and that this activity was closely controlled by an investment committee and investments in stock were only in listed corporations. I did not indicate that this was _______ Miss Zeune was also interested in what "revolving funds" are. We indicated that where these exist they are relatively small and would be operated like an imprest petty cash fund although at overseas stations larger amounts might be involved. Miss Zeune's final question was with regard to any information we could provide about the "family jewels". On this matter we could provide no information.
- 7. Mr. Mattox inquired as to whether our contingency reserve could be called a revolving fund and we said it was not. We told him that the contingency reserve is closely monitored and at no time does it have a fixed amount nor is it reimbursed for the express purpose of bringing it up to a fixed balance. The interview ended with an indication that there would be numerous interviews with other Agency personnel and that they would be formally requesting numerous documents in connection with proprietaries.

Chief Audit Staff

Chief, Audit Staff Office of Inspector General

Distribution:
Orig. - Addressee
1 - O/IG

25X1

25X1